

# **CLIPSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

I hereby give you notice that a meeting of CLIPSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE will be held at the Village Hall, Clipston on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2021 held at 7.30pm

Dated 25<sup>th</sup> October 2021  
Clerk  
Felicity Ryan  
c/o Aysgarth High Street Naseby NN6 6DD  
Tel. 01604 740429  
e-mail [clerk@clipstonparishcouncil.org](mailto:clerk@clipstonparishcouncil.org)

## **AGENDA**

207. Apologies

208. Declarations of Interest

209. Approval of the minutes from the meeting held 12<sup>th</sup> May 2021

210. Public participation

211. Publicity for the Referendum 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2021.

1. Current position
2. Suggested form of Executive Summary ("ES") of the Plan delivered to Parishioners (attached as approved by West Northamptonshire Council
3. Delivery of ES – AC volunteers
4. Suggested form of poster attached as approved by West Northamptonshire Council
5. Social Media/Banners/Parish Council website

212. Neighbourhood Plan de-brief and post plan analysis.

1. In view of the Examiner's decisions, how will the Parish Council ("PC") assess future planning applications for housing? What sites are now feasible for development? What happens to the number of houses set by the chosen site allocation, now thrown out? What is the impact of Clipston's Conservation Village status on these issues?

2. Can Tony Price and Gary Kirk recap the rationale for the chosen site allocation, especially taking into account advice from DDC (as was) about possible problems. According to DDC, questions about the proximity of the Scheduled Monument ("SM") were first raised in July 2019. The progress of the planning application for the Gold Street site then became relevant because of the proximity of the SM in that case. Given that DDC had no specified number for housing allocations, would a smaller number of developments have been a better idea? Would a tightly controlled linear expansion of the village have stood a better chance of success with the Examiner?

3. Can the PC reflect upon the relationship between the Advisory Committee ("AC") and the PC when the AC is made up of PC and non-PC members. When the 'driver' of a Neighbourhood Development Plan ("NDP") is a member of the PC, there's a danger that the PC is advising itself, and that non-PC members' views will be marginalized, or actively discouraged. In any future NDP or similar exercise, should a clear space between the 'driver' and the AC be established at the outset, controlled by the PC Chair, in order to facilitate a secure check on any perceived shortcomings, oversights, etc. in

proceedings? And in this context, did our AC have sufficient time to reflect upon ongoing developments before being asked to sign them off by a 'driver' who is also an AC member? Should details, or at least a summary, of relevant ongoing developments have been circulated to the AC well before NDP meetings?

4. Could more tasks have been delegated to AC members to guard against too much work and responsibility being invested in the hands of the 'driver'?

5. Would it have been a good idea for the three Theme Groups to meet with each other, the better to understand the interaction between their criteria, decisions, and intended outcomes? Would this have facilitated a more holistic approach to finding an identity for the parish within the aspirations of the NDP, and for selecting a site, or sites, for development? Would it have saved time and money?

6. In view of the PC meeting which took place with disgruntled parishioners could PC communications with parishioners have been improved?

7. Can members of the AC be supplied with accounts to date of fees and expenses claimed and paid in connection with the NDP, if possible broken down to provide details of how much was spent on site allocation matters.

8. Copy E Mail from AECOM dated 6<sup>th</sup> October 2021 (attached)

213. Any other matters for discussion